

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/936,621	SIEPEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lien T. Tran	1761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lien T. Tran.

(3) Cindy Semeijn (appl's rep).

(2) Susan Sipos (appl's rep).

(4) Koen Bijnvank, Kees van Woerkom (appl's rep).

Date of Interview: 17 October 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: show samples of product.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Appl's argues that amylopectin starch has high viscosity and thus one skilled in the art would have expected a reduction in the expansion; therefore, it would not have been obvious to use amylopectin starch in the prior art product to achieve high expansion. The examiner is not convinced of the argument. Appl's rep. proposed to show evidence of the relationship between viscosity and expansion. No agreement was reached with respect to the patentability of the claims..